



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

raphy of the city is in its main features precisely the same as when the first settlements were made" (p. 15) seems rather exaggerated when one remembers the cutting down of hill spurs, the rise of artificial mounds, and the general change of level. The absence of metal in the *pons Sublicius* is not in itself a sufficient ground for dating it before the knowledge of metal (p. 79). No metal was used so that the bridge could be easily destroyed. The *atrium Vestæ* is said to have had "two and perhaps three stories" (p. 201). There were certainly three and at the south side probably five. The reference to the Anglo-Saxon coins (p. 203) were better altogether omitted unless space can be spared for some further explanation. The Ionic column of the *edicula Vestæ*, referred to as *in situ* (p. 204), is a restoration. It is by no means certain that the balustrades now standing on the pavement of the forum belonged to the rostra (p. 216); it has been repeatedly asserted but never proved, and the measurements do not seem to agree. The black marble pavement was reset by Maxentius but not originally built by him (p. 239). People did not use thick slabs of marble in the time of Maxentius. The *scalæ Gemoniæ* did not branch off from the *gradus Monetæ* (p. 278), but were merely another name for that part of the *gradus Monetæ* which was near the *Carcer*. The first triumphal arch in Rome (p. 300) was not that of Q. Fabius Allobrogicus (B. C. 121) but that of Stertinus (B. C. 196, cf. Livy, XXXIII, 27). The theory of the velaria for the Colosseum is given as a fact (p. 312), whereas it is supported on very weak evidence and has grave technical difficulties.

But these suggestions, many of which are open to discussion, touch on relatively few points, considering the large number of disputed matters with which the book has to deal. Possibly they may be of use in a subsequent edition, which will undoubtedly be demanded; at any rate they are merely the exceptions which prove the generally judicious character of the statements made.

JESSE BENEDICT CARTER.

The Private Life of the Romans. By HAROLD WHETSTONE JOHNSTON. [Lake Classical Series.] (Chicago: Scott, Foresman, and Company. 1903. Pp. 344.)

TWENTY years ago the undergraduate classical courses in our American colleges and universities were limited somewhat strictly to the interpretation of a few select masterpieces of ancient literature. Barring an occasional lecture, no attempt was made to give formal instruction in the history of classical literature, institutions, archæology, or private life. Hence classical studies frequently used to be reproached with being narrowly grammatical and linguistic. As one father wittily said: "Homer may be the prince of poets and Demosthenes the prince of orators. But what of it, if after a dozen years' study of Greek my son hasn't a spark of enthusiasm for either?" This, of course, was

putting the case rather strongly, but there is no doubt that there was much justice in the protests raised against the classics as formerly pursued. Classical study did, beyond question, long shut itself up too exclusively to a study of words and sentences. In recent years, it is pleasant to note, all this has radically changed, and to-day in most institutions of consequence formal synthetic courses in the literature and institutions of the classical peoples are prominent features of the college curriculum.

The book before us is an outcome, as it is also an index, of the changed conception of classical teaching just mentioned. In fairly compact compass it treats in successive chapters of the family, the Roman name, marriage and the position of women, children and education, dependents, slaves, clients, *hospites*, the house and its furniture, dress and personal adornment, food and meals, games, the circus, gladiators, baths, travel, correspondence, books, sources of income and means of living, death and burial ceremonies.

The task which the author has set himself is no light one, for our information on many, perhaps most, of the topics here embraced is often provokingly scanty and not infrequently conflicting. Moreover no book of similar scope exists which can be regarded as at all satisfactory for the purposes of collegiate instruction. Wilkins's manual is but a primer; the work of the Misses Preston and Dodge is not merely meager in extent but rests upon no independent study; while Ramsay's work has long been hopelessly antiquated. Under these circumstances the opportunity existed to produce a work which should be a credit to its author and render a signal service to the cause of classical education. It is a pleasure to recognize that Professor Johnston has availed himself of this opportunity with eminent success. His book not merely gives ample testimony to thorough scholarship and conscientious attention to minute details, but also reveals a ripe teacher, full of pedagogical resource. Witness, for example, the diagrams prepared to illustrate *patria potestas*, *agnati*, and family relationships. A broad view characterizes the book throughout. To Professor Johnston, classical philology is evidently no mere dogma, but a living reality; and one of the most valuable features of his volume is the frequency of his observations on the relation and contrast of ancient and modern ideas and institutions.

The book is well supplied with illustrations, most of which are excellently chosen, though the purpose in including portraits of Brutus, Scipio, and Sulla in the chapter on the family, and those of sundry Roman emperors in the account of the Roman name is not obvious. Almost nothing has been omitted that could fairly be expected to find a place in a work of this character. Perhaps a somewhat fuller treatment of arts and industries might wisely be included in a subsequent edition. Apparently no mention is made of the aqueduct system, or of the *acta diurna*, the Romans' nearest approach to a newspaper. But these topics are no doubt intentionally omitted as belonging strictly within the limits of public, rather than of private, antiquities. Though

prepared primarily for professed students of the classics, Professor Johnston's volume ought to appeal to a much wider circle. It is a book which every cultivated person may read with interest and profit.

CHARLES E. BENNETT.

Roman Historical Sources and Institutions. Edited by HENRY A. SANDERS. [University of Michigan Studies, Humanistic Series, Volume I.] (New York: The Macmillan Company; London: Macmillan and Company. 1904. Pp. iv, 402.)

THE University of Michigan devotes the initial volume of her *Studies* (Humanistic Series) to a collection of essays dealing with Roman historical sources and institutions, under the editorship of Professor Henry A. Sanders. It is gratifying to receive this witness to the vitality at Michigan of a branch of investigation so undeservedly neglected in this country; and we note with satisfaction the announcement that a half-dozen volumes continuing the series are already in preparation. Apart from Professor Dennison's discussion of the singing of the "Sæcular" Hymn, all the papers are historical in theme. They display diligence and zeal; in view of our American failure to insist upon drill in clear and easy English composition as a preliminary to historical writing, it is perhaps ungracious to object to their literary baldness and disjointedness; but none of the essays shows a facile pen.

Miss Mary G. Williams of Mt. Holyoke follows up her *Julia Domna* (*American Journal of Archaeology*, 2d series, VI, 259-305) of 1902 with a similar study of Julia Mamæa. This is accurate and exhaustive. Dr. Duane R. Stuart investigates Dio Cassius's use of epigraphic material, and reaffirms the earlier verdict of negligence. Professor Drake takes Cauer's tabulation (now over twenty years old!) of inscriptions relating to officers below the centurion's rank, and traces the rise and decline of the *principalitas* in the pre-Diocletian army. Dr. G. H. Allen of Cincinnati presents a valuable study of centurions as substitute commanders, based on the inscriptions.

Professor Sanders's two disquisitions occupy well toward one-half the volume. In the first, he collects all versions of the Tarpeia myth, following Krahner, and adds some allied stories. Two of these, Persian myths whose irrelevancy he admits, are quoted in French and German versions long since superseded; another, a Charlemagne story found in the *Chronicon Novaceliense* (3, 14), is taken, without indication of ultimate origin, from Grimm's *Deutsche Sagen*! The whole study would have gained greatly by compression and elimination; it is hard to winnow out the wheat, and even the sensible discussion of the origin of the myth lacks clearness. Misprints (especially in the Greek quotations) and inconveniences are too frequent. Nonius and Gellius are cited from old texts with readings now abandoned. After the Nissen-Haupt controversy and Döhner's excellent dissertation, it is strange to be referred back to Schmidt on Zonaras's use of Plutarch.